Transcription ICANN61 San Juan
RySG-Geo TLD Group Planning Session
Sunday, 11 March 2018 at 15:15 AST
Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or
inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to
understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an
authoritative record.

The transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar
page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay. My name is Dirk Krischenowski, Vice chair of the (gTLD) group and
I'd like to open the (gTLD) meeting here at the 61's ICANN meeting in Puerto
Rico and San Juan. And I would like to invite the people here on the table
and in the room to announce themselves so that we have a proper list first.

Maybe at (Richard) you start?

Richard Wein: Hello. My name is Richard Wein. I'm coming from (TOD) (unintelligible)
provider.

Steinar Grotterod: My name Steinar Grotterod coming from (dot global). I've been invited here,
because (dot global) is not a (GEO), but (unintelligible) thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Cedric Pernet: Hi. My name is Cedric Pernet. I come from France on the representative
Paris.

Man 4:   I would like telling you who I am, but (GDPR) forbids me from doing that. In (unintelligible) some people know me as (Anolayo)

WoLucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Woman 2:   (Unintelligible) from (unintelligible) registered (unintelligible) operator.

Simla Budhu: (Unintelligible) from (unintelligible) Africa registry and (unintelligible).

Ronald Schwaerzler: Ronald Schwaerzler, treasurer of the (gTLD) group and representing registry .wein, .koeln and .cologne.

Dirk Krischenowski: Dirk Krischenowski, Vice Chair of the GeoTLD group representing Hambrg and Berlin as (unintelligible) domains.

Sue Schuler: I'm Sue Schuler. I'm the Secretariat for the Registries Stakeholder Group.

Lucky Masilela: Lucky Masilela representing dot Africa, dot Joberg, dot Capetown and .Durban.

Peter Vergote: Peter Vergote from DNS) Belgium with registry operator for two (gTLD)s (dot Brussel) (unintelligible) and one (CCTLD) (dot B).

Man 6:   (Unintelligible) from (unintelligible) to registry back end services for a number of (gTLD)s including (dot Swiss) and (unintelligible)…

((Crosstalk))

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Lucky Masilela: with dot Barcelona (unintelligible) (GO1). And - well actually in the same line as what (unintelligible) said, you know, (dot global) is not the (gTLD), but has something to do with the Earth so to speak. And one of the (gTLD)s that we

work on right now is (dot sport), is actually very strongly geographically oriented in a different way than a (gTLD), but I think it's probably an interesting thing to discuss.

Man 7:   And my name is (unintelligible) from (Naguiss), which is the registry operation - operator of (dot sport) (gTLD).

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay. (Unintelligible). Are there any people in the back who want to make it to the protocol?

Man 9:   Sure. (Unintelligible) registry operator (unintelligible) (dot Kiwi).

Dirk Krischenowski: Thank you very much.

Louis Houle: My name is Louis Houle from dot Quebec.

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay. Thank you.

So Sebastien Ducos couldn't make it. He had two of this meeting, so -- Ronald and me -- we will share the agenda and guide you through the meeting and all the discussion points. I think we have quite a number of points to make today and to - on Wednesday too, so if we are not coming through the GDRP point this time, we can do it on Wednesday too.

So I was in the GNSO meeting half an hour ago and there's some breaking news, because they presented a timeline for the new (gTLD) program for the first time of nearly official - I can't say if it's official, but it was a GNSO (S-case) timeline for the next round and it says the applicant guidebook will be ready for public comment and queue one 2020. The board will - or ICANN will approve the applicant guidebook in queue three 2020 and the application submission period starts in queue one 2021.

That's pretty top - no one announced that timeline. It was just there and I wanted to let you know all about this.

Lucky Masilela: Are you taking bets on the date?

Dirk Krischenowski: No. Jeff Newman already complained that when this timeline gets into effect or even a little bit later than we have a decade from the last round to the next round, which is in discuss (unintelligible) so it's -- yes -- that was the discussion there in the - in GNSO.

So - yes?

WoLucky Masilela: Thank you for sharing this. And do you have - well, you said that was the best case timeline? Did they share anything about a more moderate suggestion or anything?

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay. (Unintelligible) no. No. No. It was just that timeline, which was first presented. We don't have a medium or worst-case like in the application round.

I think we come to the agenda now of our meeting.

WoLucky Masilela: Sorry. (Unintelligible).

Dirk Krischenowski: (Unintelligible).

WoLucky Masilela: Here we go.

Dirk Krischenowski: Agenda. Next slide please.

So for day one we have some housekeeping issues, membership financial project spendings, objectives. So these things. Then a discussion about

geographic names, not - that's not all points we might touch and (unintelligible) members exchange on day two. That's the next slide.

We have GDRP continued, which ICANN models community and et cetera.

Then we might have an interesting session on how to integrate (work press) to become one of the choices when people open a (work press) account with (gTLD) and then any other business.

Okay. Then I think we can start with the housekeeping on day one. So with this meeting here being now - have it - well we have now two meetings with one and a half hours. Before we had two meetings was two hours and before that we had one meeting was four hours in a row more or less.

So I'm not sure whom to ask - yes and we're don't finishing our points in these three hours. Although we have three meetings or four meetings a year. I think we need some more time to discuss hearing the ICANN meetings. That's one point.

Do you want to…

Ronald Schwaerzler: Especially the second meeting on Wednesday evening I think is 1700 to - or something like just to 1830 is a time when many people are already leaving or -- so let's say -- are on the plane.

So we got - we get shifted to the edges of the meetings -- or see where I'm looking at you -- who should we address this -- let's say -- complaint to -- yes -- to you, but whom do we address? Because it's getting worst.

Sue Schuler: This is Sue Schuler for the record.

The meetings team for ICANN has now shifted to where they're doing, like, these pods. And I don't know if you've noticed in the meetings, there are

specific breaks that we have to take that are mandatory now. And we can only fill these specific pods.

Based on the number of meetings that I requested from the Registries Stakeholder Group I try to accommodate everyone, but then if somebody complains then I try to do kind of a, "Okay. You get the later time this time and I'll get the later time the next time." I mean I - it's very difficult.

Some of the days get filled so quickly. They did not allow us to do anything against the cross community topics, which left Monday completely out. We couldn't schedule anything. Tuesday we can't schedule against, because those are constituency days. So I mean it really started to limit where I could put you.

So - and I'm not averse to requesting a third session, if you want a third session, if you need more time.

Lucky Masilela: But what…

Sue Schuler: The biggest…

Lucky Masilela: …(unintelligible)?

Sue Schuler: No - well -- I mean -- or earlier. I mean if you wanted to meet on Saturday. I'm - yes, I know. It's tough.

                   I can even get you two meetings in a day if you wanted to do that. The problem is I can only request in these little 90-minute blocks that they do.

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Sue Schuler: So -- if you want two sessions on Wednesday -- I can do that for you. If you want two sessions on Sunday I can do that. You know, just let - you tell me

what you want and I'll request it. I mean the worst they can say is no. But I will definitely push for you. I mean that's - okay.

Dirk Krischenowski: So any comments on this from the group? Any wishes where we should have the meeting and maybe on Saturday or Sunday morning or what's your take on this?

Ronald Schwaerzler: (Unintelligible) I think Saturday and Sunday would be best instead of having it on Saturday, both meetings all on a Saturday. Instead split them across two days to allow those who arriving a day late on Sunday to at least be able to attend one of the two meetings.

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay. Yes. Next point on - we will look for that, Ronald.

Lucky Masilela: Yes.

Dirk Krischenowski: And push together with Sebastien.

Okay. The next point is we need more content on our website. I think we have a good website. We will present something later. (Unintelligible) present on that and - but it would be great if you have stories to share about projects, about domain names, which made it into the (unintelligible) which was a lot of advertising, so that would be really great. Any stories would enhance our position on the web. So send it to Ronald, to me, to (Sebastien).

Ronald Schwaerzler: This is Ronald. The best (unintelligible) will be (office@gotod.group), because all three of us are looking into that mailbox.

And some personal note on this. I did a marvelous trip to P.D. Montero in January. Thanks to Lucky and his team I still don't have to content on the (gTLD) website. So I'm looking for a marketing -- let's say -- story on what tremendous marketing activity you did. It's not only about climbing to (unintelligible) P.D. Montero (unintelligible) 24 days (unintelligible) -- what

was it -- West - no, Eastern South Africa up to Nairobi (unintelligible). I met you people there. It was such a tremendous thing. This should be one of the main stories on the (gTLD)'s website. Not because I was able to do P.D. Montero, but there was 17 of us and - but the road show in (unintelligible) were that great. They should absolutely be on the website.

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay. And next point, the meetings - the next meetings in - of a group in a couple - the next couple of months during the GDD summit and it's -- I think -- you have the more information (unintelligible).

Ronald Schwaerzler: The GDD Summit meeting. GDD takes place from Monday, 14th of May, starting -- I think -- at 1900 in the evening, 1800 in the evening with a cocktail reception. And will end on Thursday, 12:30. As the past GDD industry summit meetings were timed exactly the same.

We will start at 1300 on Thursday afternoon with our (gTLD) meeting. So please don't leave the GDD summit immediately after 12:30, but reserve some extra hours to attend the (gTLD) meeting there.

As a side note there'll be another meeting -- 1300 to 1700 -- a registry operator's meeting also. So if you're traveling with (unintelligible) so one could attend the (gTLD) meeting, the other one the registry operator meeting. So these are - I think these are -- at least -- two meetings, side meetings at the GDD industry summit that are worth witnessing.

For the (gTLD) meeting at ICANN 62, Panama City, this is - currently we are not planning to hold a (gTLD) meeting. We are trying to get a - probably a meeting or a get-together for the ones of the (gTLD) group reception or -- let's say -- (unintelligible) together or whatever if it can find a sponsor. So whoever wants to sponsor is heavily invited.

But it is a policy meeting I think. There won't be that many (gTLD) group members in Panama, so that we will not do a official (gTLD) meeting at ICANN 62.

We have already scheduled a meeting in late September like we had in the past years in (Starsbook) hosted by (unintelligible). It will be about 20th to 25th of September. So -- again -- Thursday, Friday, last or the second last weekend in September.

I also got confirmation by (Denick) that they will sponsor this event and invite us to an evening dinner. And we will have the (gTLD) meeting at ICANN 63, which will take place in Barcelona Catalonia Spain. Yes. (Unintelligible).

Lucky Masilela: I want to amend you now on this Catalonia Spain thing. We'll have that over (unintelligible), Ronald. No. Just one thing I want to say about that meeting -- that happens in Barcelona as said -- and (unintelligible) being some (unintelligible) and especially (unintelligible). We have asked ICANN to hold (GEO) linguistic region (unintelligible) special meeting on Friday. So I can has 99% agree now to give us the whole Friday in the meeting venue for our meeting (unintelligible) your meeting. So we'll be circulating sometime -- or (unintelligible) October -- but (unintelligible) asking you for ideas.

So the (unintelligible) to (unintelligible) there on Friday, therefore Saturday, Sunday would be a good time to do (unintelligible) and the (gTLD) meeting (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) to the European (unintelligible).

But we would like focusing on things that are useful for public administrations and communities, not just presenting (POD)s, but we would like having tables of cities, of regions, of linguistic cultural (gTLD)s and presenting ideas, projects that have been beneficial for their own communities. On top of the other that are relevant to us (unintelligible) but not (unintelligible) experience for us. It should be to the outside world. Okay?

And we'll try to have some promotion on that. And we're prepared that with (unintelligible) and also the new team from the (unintelligible) over there, because they are ready now to the meeting. Okay?

Ronald Schwaerzler: Just one clarification. What's being requested is not the whole day for the (gTLD) group meeting without the knowledge…

Lucky Masilela: No. No.

Ronald Schwaerzler: …(unintelligible) (gTLD) (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Ronald Schwaerzler: So it's a long day session to discuss (GEO) oriented aspects of the…

Lucky Masilela: Yes.

Ronald Schwaerzler: …(unintelligible) and the…

Lucky Masilela: But open to the…

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwaerzler: …(unintelligible).

Lucky Masilela: …public. It's not just our meeting.

Ronald Schwaerzler: Yes. Yes.

Lucky Masilela: Something that should be open to the public.

Ronald Schwaerzler: Yes. And it is…

Lucky Masilela: Okay?

Ronald Schwaerzler: …open (unintelligible) to half - some (gTLD) group official meeting, presentation, whatever we discuss.

Lucky Masilela: So that will be Friday, 19th?

Ronald Schwaerzler: Yes.

Lucky Masilela: Because the only way we would have the whole day available in a big room to have this public forum. Okay?

Ronald Schwaerzler: So it will be - this is what I wanted to ask. It would be Friday the 19th?

Lucky Masilela: Yes.

Ronald Schwaerzler: So it is - would be good reason for any (gTLD) representative to already be at Barcelona on the 19th, so that we could do then our (gTLD) meetings later on Saturday and Sunday.

Lucky Masilela: Exactly.

Ronald Schwaerzler: Because we have good reason to be there (unintelligible).

Lucky Masilela: Yes.

Ronald Schwaerzler: Okay.

Dirk Krischenowski: Thank you very much. That is good news for…

Lucky Masilela: It's not (unintelligible) but (unintelligible).

Lucky Masilela: Very close.

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay.

Ronald Schwaerzler: Okay.

Lucky Masilela: Because…

Lucky Masilela: What are you implying, Ronald? Let's just (unintelligible).

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay. We come to the next point in housekeeping.

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes. Oh sorry.

Lucky Masilela: Just a heads-up, you know, I'm looking at these dates. They are so close to each other just by a month, the (unintelligible) and the Catalonia. For us traveling eight hours away from Catalonia and (Stressbook). It'll be nice if this event would then be combined since it's just a month away, you know, but it's a heads-up if we had to consider that, you know. Okay.

Ronald Schwaerzler: We cannot move the ICANN meeting and we saw that having the - and then we were advised -- and I think (unintelligible) -- the day before they start is much better than the last Friday or the Saturday, because people will tend to leave afterwards. Yes? So it's easier to get people one day earlier than one day afterwards. This is why we were granted the Friday 19th. Yes.

We can discuss it. We'll try to discuss it with (unintelligible) and see how we can try to move the calendar.

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes.

Lucky Masilela: I mean -- if I were to last (unintelligible) this -- just a suggestion is, if they then proceed (unintelligible) ICANN participation the day before the 19th -- or even the 18th, 19th -- it's easier to make one trip than two trips up north is (unintelligible). That's the thinking, you know?

Ronald Schwaerzler: But you don't know how nice it is (unintelligible) work.

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay. And speaking - then we'll come - if then - I don't know (unintelligible) things we come to the next point of the housekeeping.

Ronald Schwaerzler: This is Ronald. I want to give you an overview of -- let's say -- the group parameters.

And first thing is to show you our member's hour of service. We have seven of service. I (unintelligible) talk to (unintelligible) machines group and (unintelligible) machines (TMBH) to become members. I have already talked to (Casper), so we will have this three -- they're very high percentage -- as full members also. (Unintelligible) official (unintelligible) if not able to try (unintelligible) as a member from their statutes.

And the other three of service -- like (dot U.S.A.), (unintelligible) and (TLD) box -- are not running another registry operators at the moment and thereby - therefore can only be of service according to our statutes.

Next slide please. So is - yes. These are the members and one will notice that from Fundacio puntCAT is already listed as a member here. We got communication last year that they will join us. I think I did not get the membership form so far, but I trust that they will become members. All the others are members like they have been before.

Next slide please. Yes. These are the - what I did forget is -- as a - obviously -- as observer is (ENF) (unintelligible) the registry (unintelligible) provider.

Sorry for that. I will correct for that in the slides. That will available for download. Because we have two registry service (unintelligible) provider like TLD .box and the (DNS) Africa as (unintelligible) service. My error, sorry.

Okay. Next slide please. And resulting out of this memberships and (observership) fees this is what I tried to give you as our balance or as the financials of our group. Our bank account as a account balance of $16,244.44 Euros, so 16 point something thousand Euros. Which is roughly the balance for the (unintelligible) we are missing two membership fee payments, so we'll - if you look at the text declaration we will have a membership or an account balance of 70,700 and 1500 are outstanding. I hope they will pay. I - we don't know yet, but this is the absolute minimum that is our funding at the moment.

Next slide please. We have an unchanged membership fees table. So we decided that the (unintelligible) come to leave it the same for the year, so it's listed here on the slide. The minimum fee is 500 and if you're getting (unintelligible) you're paying at 250 Euros extra. So if you're a member (unintelligible) of them 50,000 to 100,000 -- for example -- it's 1500 if you're a (unintelligible) 100,000 you're paying 7050 or whatever.

And the member - the observer fee is 250 less than the full membership fees would be. Resulting of the previous list of members and getting them the payments that are -- according to their domain names -- I took their domain name count of March 1st, so last weeks.

Next slide please. This would result in expected payments for memberships and observers of 28,000 Euros, so that we have -- giving our bank account -- added to what we're getting for the year of 2018, would have roughly 45,000 Euros available for the group. We have fixed cost of about 4500 Euros including the registry stakeholder groups membership fee, which is calculated by the (CON). I'm looking at you about - on the highest - on the number of registrations (unintelligible) domain names on the management of our

member. Last year it was -- I think -- it was (dot) London. This year it could be (dot) London or (dot Cat). I think (dot Cat) is much larger. Yes. So we will be at about $2000 to be spent on the registry stakeholder group membership fee.

Sue Schuler: I'm going to make a slight correction, because (dot Cat) is already a member of the registry stakeholder group. Also it's the largest…

Ronald Schwaerzler: Non-member.

Sue Schuler: …that - non-member of the registry.

Ronald Schwaerzler: Okay. (Unintelligible)…

((Crosstalk))

Sue Schuler: (Unintelligible) we base it off (unintelligible)…

Ronald Schwaerzler: So it would be either…

((Crosstalk))

WoLucky Masilela: …(unintelligible).

Ronald Schwaerzler: …(dot) Tokyo or (dot) London again. Yes. Sorry.

And we have a financial account and we have domains, we have hosting. So approximately 40,000 Euros is our (unintelligible) that we can spend for projects for activity for making our website greater or whatever. So this is what we have. The money that we can plan on activities for that year.

Next slide please. Okay.

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes. This - Dirk Krischenowski again. So what we were discussing in the last meetings what our groups should do and where to spend the money. And one topic was -- and we already have offers here from people to hire (Maria Farrel), which already worked (unintelligible) on our website to make it a little bit more professional from the language. So Ronald, me and (Sebastien) are not the - yes -- (Sebastien) is more native, but more French…

((Crosstalk))

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Dirk Krischenowski: …Australian (unintelligible). More native than we. So, but (Maria) is really great. She knows the ICANN - yes.

So we have an offer to spend (unintelligible) as an objective to make the benefits of the (gTLD)s more visible and more findable to stakeholders and the public for 3500 Euros. Here I think this is a reasonable offer and we all in the (unintelligible) we'll - we work (unintelligible) to define -- let's say -- just put in - circle idea here where many people are reading things about our industry as a serious source.

So that's one topic we want to spend this year. And the next - any questions on that?

Lucky Masilela: Or comment.

Ronald Schwaerzler: This is Ronald. Just as a clarification (Maria) will edit and professionally word the contents that we provide to her. Yes? She will also find topics that will fit to be presented on the (gTLD) website. So she will do her own editorial things, but mainly focus on the things that are - let's say we (GDPR) must be an issue on the (gTLD) working group.

She is professional enough to do a -- let's say -- an article, like, she publishes on circle idea or whatever. But whenever you have a topic that you think it should be there -- and if you're like me, a non-native speaker -- you can somehow text it, give it to (Maria) and she will make it - wrote it professionally, because we shouldn't have any typos or grammatically erroneous text on the website. This is - and this is what (Maria) would be paid and willing to do sort of things.

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay. And the next slide please. And another project is - so the (CCN) is (unintelligible) and the rest is the stakeholder group and the (BRG) they are having quite good -- yes -- a touchable content or means -- a brochure or a flyer -- and I think that's one missing point we have to make ourselves more, not only more visible, but also findable and emotional to the stakeholders. So if they see all our logos and the diversity -- which we present throughout all over the world -- it's -- I think -- a thing we should transport also not only by the website, but with a brochure or a flyer that - we have an offer to do a really professional thing for 3000 Euro with an agency in Germany and South Africa and that would be another approach at - to bring us up to a level where (CCNSO) registry stakeholder group and (BOG) are all already in (unintelligible).

Sue Schuler: Hi. This is Sue Schuler. If I can comment on that. The brochure that you see in the registration packet for ICANN 61 here is that the registration stakeholder - okay. I work with the design team in ICANN and they do it for free. So I can put you in touch with all of that. I sent them what I wanted done. I sent it to their design team. They designed it up. They print it, they stuff it. I - we don't pay for that.

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay. Okay. I haven't seen this, so I will look into this…

Sue Schuler: Yes. Just…

Dirk Krischenowski: …that which would…

Sue Schuler: …call me.

Dirk Krischenowski: …really fit on this. So that would be another project to reasonably spend money if we don't get it for free.

Sue Schuler: Right.

Dirk Krischenowski: Which would be really great. We'll check this out.

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes.

Sue Schuler: I'm sorry. Yes. (Unintelligible).

Dirk Krischenowski: So you were volunteering also for the GeoTLD Group?

Sue Schuler: Well I do work quite a bit with them. I - but yes.

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay. Next slide please. And the last project is to have - we discussed this also many times to have a professional dashboard on the key performance indicators. We have a lot of reasons to do this. And that was done by a (dot) (unintelligible) our company in (dot) Berlin the last times and so a lot of work.

And it was done only once the year and I think we should have that on a monthly basis, like, center does have it and this is something I wanted to present you in some more pictures on the next slide that will start - would start there.

One of the companies giving us an offer was (NTOD) stats. You probably know all (NTOD) stats. They could do such a thing which they do for all the

(TOD)s for the (gTLD)s group as well, would be more or less the same layout and with some additional things like pages that Google, pages at Alexa and something - these key performance indicators we have. That's one.

The next one is registry offers. I talked to the (dot global) guys and (Stana) is here. They have a pretty good dashboard for (dot global) and could do this also for us. Maybe, (Stana), you could say something on that too?

Man 10:   Yes. Yes. That's why I'm here I guess. Well…

((Crosstalk))

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Man 10:   Yes. I do love you.

The - I think we - what we have done with the registry office is that we have tried to take the (unintelligible) that we get from the back-end provider or a back-end provider and present that in a business model that we need for all the business.

If I understand it correctly you saw a demo of the registry office (unintelligible) something like that and you saw that immediately it could be transferred into a dashboard for the (gTLD)s.

You want me to - Dirk, you want me to go through the public proposal?

Dirk Krischenowski: No. Not - I'm sorry, not the whole proposal and that would take too much time. I think this is a good tool.

Man 10:   We like it.

Dirk Krischenowski: So…

Man 10: Surprisingly. There also some clients that we have -- subscribers -- to the system. And what we - very (unintelligible) what we do is that we take the transaction data, we don't modify them, we just collect them and we present it in a business model.

And with the dashboard we will use different sources to present to you the key (unintelligible) that you want to have for your dashboard. So that's - and that's the essence of it.

Dirk Krischenowski: (Unintelligible) first?

Lucky Masilela: Just a suggestion when it comes to the (KPI)s. I'm not sure if (unintelligible) is (unintelligible) or anyone else for the business for that matter would be the best approach, because when it comes to what kind of things we are seeing that should be measurable. We have a good idea of what we need. So the input from another party that is not internal to the group is not necessarily any good addition.

I mean I don't say it has to be bad, but what I think is a - maybe we could form a working group to think what could be (unintelligible) half there and then if this is something that needs to have a (unintelligible) take it to some experts outside the business. You see my point, right? Because then we may take the benefit of the feedback that somebody could tell us, "Look, you're getting it wrong.", because, you know, you're focusing on these, because you are too much into your thing.

Ronald Schwaerzler: This is Ronald. This is exactly what I wanted to mention before you said it.

(NTOD) stat is doing its stats -- for example -- out of the (CCDS) file or what - of whatever. You can probably display some additional information making it -
- yes -- nicer or whatever, but what I understand from (KPI)s -- for example --

is how many of the domain names -- don't get me wrong -- of (dot) Amsterdam -- for example -- are really registries to end-users and how many domain names are just registered as -- let's say -- landing pages for premiums, because this gives a difference. What is the turnover of a registry if I look at (dot Cologne) -- for example -- who sells to the registrar with 550 having 25,000 domain names makes a turnover of 150,000. The (unintelligible) it's 15,000 domain names for 20 Euros, which makes 300,000 turnover. So (Vienna) has less domain names, but approximately the double of turnover.

So developing a price model for the next round -- (TOD)s for example -- could be very good. Is it really depending on the price you sell it? Or this is what I'm looking for a (KPI) -- let's say -- indicator, not just a domain numbers. Because the numbers giving away domain names for free. We will probably just cast the items of digital (unintelligible) during these meetings.

(Dot) London - please forgive me if I'm quoting some examples, but on London has -- I think -- 15,000 domain name registration during the last some weeks and you see this typical spikes of additions of 5000 domain names any week.

So -- okay -- they have 80 or something thousand domain names at the moment, but at least these 15,000 are not really registered domain names. They are some promotional domain names.

If (unintelligible) having 80,000 domain names, but only 50,000 of them paid it can be worth, but key performance indicator could tell us -- members of the group -- whether it's worst or not.

My personal opinion this (KPI)s will something internal that only members could see. Because someone would have to disclose internal information. Out of my 25,000 domain names only 20 are really registered. The others are given away for free or something like this. So I'm very much with (Nacho)

saying let's do a definition of what we want to have, what are we willing to deliver? Probably the other registries are not willing to deliver these so-called secrets. Yes? And - but this is the quality of the key performance indicators in the end.

Sorry for being…

Dirk Krischenowski: (Unintelligible).

Ronald Schwaerzler: …(unintelligible).

Simla Budhu: (Unintelligible). I actually had exactly those questions, because I don't know if everybody is willing to share that. You might want to think about a personalized dashboard probably. So -- yes -- you are comparing yourself against the average.

And if you are looking at domain data where you are looking into registrant information you will have a problem with (GDPR) things of course, because if you're, you know, and do the statistics on that that's kind of a problem.

Ronald Schwaerzler: Yes. Before we have also published the key performance indicators -- which have been agreed by the group and at this time -- only for internal reasons we didn't publish that to externals even if there were no secrets, which are not publically available. They are - and what we can - we should do it like the (CCTOD)s, do it - they have that external part of statistics and they have a internal dashboard -- I think -- for each (TOD) and for the group that makes absolutely sense.

((Crosstalk))

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Dirk Krischenowski: Sorry?

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible) say (unintelligible) I was just saying but they have lots of money, talking about (unintelligible).

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes. Okay. Maybe we can have the next slide to have the full set of people - that's the guy -- (Patrick Myers) -- who runs all the statistics for (Senda) and he could do it for us as well. And we have an offer from him to do that. That statistic doesn't look so sexy, but he can do it. I'm sure. And he does it on a regular basis for the (gTLD)s already, but only some data, not all the data.

We would like to have - but he could integrate these data as well. And he's from our business and it's his daily business to do that.

Maybe we can have the next slide overview over the three once we have - from (NTOD) stats I didn't get an offer. They have their own development for the (NTOD) stats and what they would do they would build a second (NTOD) stats just for the (gTLD)s. That's their scope. Then we have the registry offers and they have their own software as well or own development there now. Is it right? Yes.

And developing in this (unintelligible) for the registry offers, customers and we have a office now - a office there of 10,000 Euros development costs.

Lucky Masilela: It's dollars.

Dirk Krischenowski: It's dollars. Okay. It's - yes. It's dollars then. Set up and the first year's fees are $5000 and annually it would be $2500. And then we would have the offer of (Patrick Myers) who runs the center stats and he uses the Tableau software, which is a - quite popular software for statistics and he would set up this thing with the key performance indicators we had before, not with the new ones, but I think that's - if we deliver the data it's easy to integrate new key performance indicators here. Set up $2000 and annually $5000.

We don't need to decide now. We should -- I think -- and a opinion was to have a group to finally define the parameters and then we go back to these three guys and ask them what they can offer us.

Lucky Masilela: I just want to change the registryoffice.com, because it doesn't exist. Registryoffice.global is the link to the site.

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible) now.

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay. Okay. We'll do that.

((Crosstalk))

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Dirk Krischenowski: So -- yes -- that was a discussion on the spending I think. Here we need -- for the statistics -- we need some more discussion, but the other things we were going to start then.

Okay. We have - as next slide we have the achievements of - in 2007 (unintelligible) to shortly run a presented how many new - how many members we have and how many observers and representing altogether as a number of (gTLD)s.

We have -- in the last year and the (unintelligible) before - year before -- (unintelligible) on model, which was interestingly -- I think -- (Sebastien) and (Marian). I think there's a lot of work in this. They were the basis also for the eco-model and I think we presented the first model -- how it can - could work -- and it was pretty close to that what we now have there. That was very good work.

We did them. We have all the rankings presented and we have become the number one resource on (gTLD)s on the internet and (Rona) prepared on the next slide some statistic for us.

Ronald Schwaerzler: So this is Ronald. If you look at the statistic, the yearly statistics for -- from January to December -- you'll see a - without any interpretation problems more or less increase probably during summer days a little bit of a decline, but in principally to steady getting better visibility for our website.

Next slide please. This is - by the way this is - with it this is page views. Then what is very interesting is there are the main users are coming from. Yes? China, Russian foundation, Taiwan, the top three. So I very much suppose that these are some kind of machines that are doing whatever, yes?

Also it could be the reason, because we are doing most of the technical editorial thing of correcting things, yes? Then again it's United States, Hong Kong, Ukraine, yes?

((Crosstalk))

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Ronald Schwaerzler: Yes. But in principle we have visibility all over the world and take away the ones that seem to somehow do machinery based readings, yes. Even Germany and I think the reason is sitting less to me, Dirk is giving up most of the content to the website, so Dirk's very much - thanks to doing that. And we are trying to put it into -- let's say -- shape, but most of the content is coming from (dot) Berlin, it's coming from (dot) (unintelligible), it's coming from Dirk and thanks for that.

Dirk Krischenowski: Welcome.

Ronald Schwaerzler: Next slide (unintelligible)?

Lucky Masilela: Next slide (unintelligible)?

Lucky Masilela: Is it?

((Crosstalk))

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Lucky Masilela: Okay.

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes.

Lucky Masilela: Yes.

Dirk Krischenowski: Dirk Krischenowski again. The objectives for 2018 is on - to be defined, but we said we need to grow (unintelligible) on order to effectively push our interests towards on the stakeholders and we have a lot of topics like (GEO) names and (DTPR) and others. Contribute valuable input so that I can process on these topics. Then all the things where we are now working on a professional presentations, high and unique content and text and graphics to maintain this as number one resource for people looking for the (gTLD) stuff.

Professionalize the statistics and grow our member basis was the next round (TLD)s, so -- yes -- that had - the next round has moved a bit away, but I think we have spilled some (gTLD)s which could become member and we should work on this as well.

Any comments on this? Then we…

Ronald Schwaerzler: Me.

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes.

Ronald Schwaerzler: Let me just comment our (unintelligible) input, so I can process as (GDPR) and so.

Dirk said our model that primarily was (unintelligible) and a (unintelligible) and ethnic is very close to the ICANN model that is presented now and to the eco-model and whatever.

We defined the output of the WHOIS, which field should be hidden and (unintelligible). And this is -- let's say -- 90 (unintelligible) nine -- if not 100% -- exactly the - exactly what we such as it's too high (unintelligible) to display the fields. Yes?

So and this is a -- I think -- a very good work, a very good achievement and we were already in - in September we were already confident that what should be hidden, what should be displayed and thanks -- again -- to remember so contributed on that.

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay. Then we are done with the housekeeping and move onto the topics, which have been raised by members in which are up to date.

First of all last meeting in Abu Dhabi we talked about two lists, which had been proposed by us, the U.N. list for the working group five on geographic names, the U.N. list with 4000 city names and the (unintelligible) list was - this was over 1000 heritage sides. They didn't made it already into - although they have been communicated to that group and so (Cathrine) from (dot) (unintelligible) is in that group and she would push that these - those lists where we said that would be fine if these lists are added to the applicant guidebook as reserved for the next round work on this more.

Then we have the two-letter domain names country codes. And I think Lucky wanted to have first some discussion and share experience on that point.

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible) to lead that one.

Simla Budhu: So actually it doesn't relate to release of two-letter country codes per say. It's more in relation to the (unintelligible) of (IGO) labels that exist on an ICANN resolve name list where there are no exemption procedures available for redemption. So it's not necessarily usually two-letter country codes. Because they're the - already is a procedure in place for release of - or for registration of domain names where you can simply, you know, approach the relevance (CCTLD) or country code administrator and/or the (unintelligible) represents (unintelligible) get permission from them for release provided it doesn't create any confusion.

So this is relating to the (IGO) list of domain names. Well not domain names, off labels where we have - I'm not sure (unintelligible) are we at liberty to disclosed exactly which...

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible)…

Simla Budhu: …label?

Lucky Masilela: …(unintelligible) is (unintelligible).

Simla Budhu: It's just to give some context to the conversation is that African Union -- AU -- is on the (IGO) list without exception procedures.

Now if we want to release that label from that list there is no procedure. And -- yet -- at the same time there is a provision in the contract, the registry, a operator agreement with ICANN, which says that those particular labels cannot be registered and they cannot resolve in the (DNS).

So our question is what is the solution, because -- for us -- it leads to unintended consequences. For example the fact that a domain can -- under the (IGO) list -- can sit in that list forever without a procedure or based on --

and I'm sure we all appreciate ICANN's processes and not the most expeditious -- that we might find ourselves in a catch-22 where a rightful holder wants to release that domain from that list except there's no procedure.

But if we approach ICANN and we may be hit with an compliance issue from a contractual point of view. So, yes. That's some of the background here.

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible) a question from the outside? Are you sure you want to propose more names to be reserved globally? Reservation is a nightmare.

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Lucky Masilela: No cities and no place.

Simla Budhu: No. No. No.

Lucky Masilela: Right?

Simla Budhu: No. That…

Lucky Masilela: Okay. Now - in regarding the question for the - for AU which we have had as a problem in some (TOD)s -- you and the others -- my understanding is that the revision for next summer for some of the lists the Olympic committee -- et cetera -- will be allowed to be reduced by the parties of (unintelligible). So probably if African Union goes to ICANN and says, "Look, you (unintelligible) these are the release in the same sense of the entity on behalf of which these were split in the least a request of domain." It should be allowed to reduce to that.

So I think that ICANN has (unintelligible) problem and they are trying to get somewhere with a little support from everybody saying that this is the best one, yes?

Simla Budhu: Thank you (unintelligible). Do we have a timeframe when that remedy would be available? Because for us -- obviously -- it's a timing issue. We understand that there are other procedures that are available for us to follow in order to release that particular label. But based on what you've just indicated do we have an indication of the timeframe when something like that...

Lucky Masilela: Yes.

Simla Budhu: …be implemented?

Lucky Masilela: It would require ICANN to have something like it's one of their - this policies where they apply (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) that and the time for implementation is always some months, a time for discussion is some months. So I would say if you're (unintelligible) one year from now.

But, you know, timelines in ICANN, you know, do not rhyme.

((Crosstalk))

Simla Budhu: (Unintelligible).

Lucky Masilela: You know, it's…

Simla Budhu: True.

Ronald Schwaerzler: So -- this is Ronald -- as far as I know this is the release of names from the -- let me call it -- the reserves names. Yes? Registry reserve names is one of the top topics that the registry stakeholder group is talking to ICANN staff on Tuesday.

So it's not only about the two laterals. It's also about other names. That there is no release pass for. As far as I know, (Lucky) (unintelligible) we have talked to it is with (unintelligible) (dot) AU, (dot) Africa. AU (dot) any (TOD) name is still one of these five two-letter codes that are not allowed to (regist). Another one is (EU), another one - whatever.

Simla Budhu: (Unintelligible).

Ronald Schwaerzler: But it says in the list -- I've looked at it -- AU is reserved for the African Union. And now there is the African Union, it wants to register that domain name. And just because in the register agreement there is no procedure defined of how to get this name out of this list. It's not possible for the one it has been reserved for to register it.

This is a deadlock. This is a narrowing in a contract. One should admit it if a - if - on the -- what (Amadao) said -- the Red Cross and Olympic committees and something, if they want to have this registered they have to find a way out of it. So it must be somewhere in the near future, but there is no way out at the moment.

Which is an error.

Lucky Masilela: For what…

Ronald Schwaerzler: Which is a clear error for once regarding the error they got what they asked for. The Red Cross, the Olympic committee, the United Nations asked for these names not being the (unintelligible) registered period. They never thought the (unintelligible) the release…

WoLucky Masilela: Yes.

Ronald Schwaerzler: …at that time.

So this time the fault is not on ICANN staff for once. But not for the AU, because it's registered for the African Union and they want to register it.

Lucky Masilela: The conundrum is we would want with the AU to have this matter placed in front of (GEK) and other committees relevant to see if these names can then be released, you know, or that (unintelligible) fit. Is it (unintelligible) that and it should all be released in the (IGO) tool (unintelligible) relevant own as of the names. And this is the kind of support that we want to solicit across the floor and in this house and would want this matter to also be addressed within (GEK), you know. Yes.

Dirk Krischenowski: (Unintelligible) Dirk Krischenowski. Okay. Do we have - oh, (Richard).

Richard Wein: I was sitting in the (GEK) meeting this morning and yesterday morning. The (GEK) has established a process with GDD for governments to find out when two-letter domains are registered or being requested to be registered in any top level domain. The (GEK) is complained to the GDD that it hasn't been doing that very well.

But there is a process. It's on the web. It's on the (unintelligible) (GEK) website. Step one is the government is notified by an email of a registry request. Step two is the governments and others have 60 days to comment on the request. Step three, the registry has 60 days to propose mitigation measures to address concerns raised about confusion with the corresponding country code. And then ICANN (CDD) has to propose draft criteria to evaluate the proposal with mitigation measures.

So ultimately the country authority that has jurisdiction over the string has the ability to respond to any particular application request and approve it, deny it or whatever.

WoLucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Lucky Masilela: (Richard), you're absolutely right. This relates to (dot) -- for example -- India or whatever.

Richard Wein: No.

Lucky Masilela: But it does not relate to the five names that are on the reserves names list, because…

((Crosstalk))

Richard Wein: (Unintelligible)…

Lucky Masilela: …they are in a different list. They are in the (IGO) list, which is the one without exception. The two letters has an exception. But AU is (unintelligible) so you may release that for Australia, but…

((Crosstalk))

Richard Wein: (Unintelligible)…

Lucky Masilela: …not because it's (unintelligible) for AU in the (IGO) list. And it's the (IGO) list, the Red Cross list and the Olympic committee list, the three that don't have any exception.

Lucky Masilela: What about this one?

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible) yes. (Unintelligible) actually there is small exception with Red Cross. They have mistakes in that list and -- yes -- basically ICANN doesn't check what was put inside of those lists. For example, you talk to Red Cross of some country and they put the work they like there. Not necessary they have (unintelligible). For example that. I know it is for mistakes in this and it's well known for ICANN. They do not do any (unintelligible) check.

Lucky Masilela: They (unintelligible).

Lucky Masilela: (Lucky), what do you, like, ask us -- the (GEO) group -- to do? To support your request with the - or what (unintelligible)?

Lucky Masilela: To ensure that things you might need are not there.

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Lucky Masilela: It's highly relevant to each particular (GEO). For example, in your language you see what's there and in our case it's - they grabbed some generic terms -- for example -- like society in Russian, it's there. And right (unintelligible) have right (unintelligible) and it's not Russian Red Cross. It was (unintelligible) Red Cross.

Lucky Masilela: Okay. So a (GEO) question. What we are trying to do is we're trying to get (GEK)s to put this matter on the agenda in this meeting, ICANN 61. And placing this matter on the agenda is to have this (unintelligible) listed on all this (IGO)s, which include in particular AU (dot) Africa, so that it can be released.

I can confirm that the (GEK) will present it to you from the Africa Union (unintelligible) approach a (GEK) will present it to you from Australian government to get their support that they can use (dot) AU or AU (dot) Africa. And that letter was granted to the AU representative so that they can. They have no objections to them using AU. So that was granted.

And I think there is no confusion. We are all clear even in the list that AU is associated with the African Union. So these are the things that are quite clear.

But for us from this group is to, if we can get the support, you know, where that we need to ensure that the names are finally released from that (unintelligible) list.

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes. I see the same, because there might be terms on the list, which individually and (gTLD) wanted to have released there. But there are some confusion with the two

But there is some confusion with the two letters. For instance, in Berlin and Hamburg -- except of these six (EU) and (UN) and so on -- on the list we have registered all other two-letter names with a sister company and there's no compliance case with ICANN or something like this. They are all free including (IN) and (SZ) and whatever complaints are there. That's - so - and the Australian government wouldn't complain or couldn't complain, so you - it's double on the list, but the Australian government wouldn't have a say in it if I'm right. I might be wrong.

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Lucky Masilela: Dirk, you're absolutely right. But AU is on another list too.

Lucky Masilela: Yes.

Lucky Masilela: Yes.

Lucky Masilela: And so it's not allowed to be registered even if the one who wants to register is the one it has been reserved for. And this is…

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

WoLucky Masilela: Yes.

Lucky Masilela: Yes. So this is - so can we do a quick check? If someone again is lucky and all the AU got (unintelligible) would state that the (GEO) group is in favor of getting registry reserved names released to the one entity that it has been reserved for. I fully support it (unintelligible).

Man: Wait a second. Is the registry reserve is ICANN reserved.

Man: Or ICANN…

Man: A registry reserve is another list.

Man: Sorry. Sorry. ICANN reserved. Yes.

Man: Yes.

Lucky Masilela: Yes. So I'm personally very much in favor of this. If - I would even do a motion that we send some (unintelligible) in support of an (unintelligible) procedure for AU (dot) Africa. (Unintelligible) that's a very (unintelligible) that Africa has really had too many sad cases, right?

Lucky Masilela: I support that idea (unintelligible).

Lucky Masilela: Yes.

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay. Who can draft that letter? You?

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Lucky Masilela: Yes. (Unintelligible) send it…

WoLucky Masilela: Yes.

Lucky Masilela: …to (unintelligible).

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes. Okay. (Unintelligible).

Lucky Masilela: Yes. One thing that I noticed is that the process of getting stuff released is very, very difficult. And even if there is a process in place it's usually not worth our while as registries to go through the process to just register one domain name from that list.

I mean if it's the case where it's AU (dot) Africa was a very important organization in Africa that has a certain right to that name it's one thing, but we get a lot of requests for (unintelligible) are reserved, because ICANN has them reserved, because the country had some objections of general release of that name and it's simply not worth our while going through the process of getting that name released even if there's a process then there's a good chance for that, because the workload involved getting that domain name released to the interested individual or organization is higher than what we'll ever make on that domain name.

Dirk Krischenowski: But -- Dirk Krischenowski -- I think we should give it try. Maybe that opens a wave of the names and (unintelligible) in something. Otherwise, like, I - I've - we've talked at home and on this as well and in our company and we've had why not doing this like (dot Freesland) and (dot) Amsterdam with (unintelligible) and then they had a compliance case, but that - I'm not sure if it had insult or not. Not yet, but it's - it…

Lucky Masilela: There's a difference. They had a pressing legal reason for doing that.

Here there is a political reason, but not a pressing legal reason. That Africa has no legal obligation to give any domain. The first (unintelligible) was a question of privacy of individuals and the (DPA) say, "You don't do that." So I think it's a (unintelligible). So going a while on one topic doesn't mean that going while in (unintelligible) work, yes?

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes. And then we are done with the (GEO) names and switch over to (GDPR).

WoLucky Masilela: (Unintelligible).

Lucky Masilela: Again.

Dirk Krischenowski: No, again. New topic. So on the next slide we - the…

Lucky Masilela: (Unintelligible) slide?

Lucky Masilela: Small question (unintelligible) we are making 15 units of (unintelligible) today and then we are following up on Wednesday, right?

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes. Yes. So we are going quickly to the next slide and that - that's the topic - the interim model is touching here and I particular found a letter that - let's see what's the next slide. Okay.

And then there was a registry - registrar letter to ICANN, which addressed quite a number of questions, which haven't been solved by a lot of people like I (unintelligible) to explain the models really compliance. They just made a model, but didn't say that it's really compliant or get it approved by someone. Then it's still the question on if the full data set is needed you probably also that (Adenic) was for heading in direction to reduce a data set of four contacts in Germany to one and a half. Also at the end of - I then figured out how it was at the end of the day, but drastically we reduced the data set and the data retention. How long do you need to stall the data.

Then the email topic, should there be a possibility to directly contact the registrant or only while the registry, then the (unintelligible) access was - we had a lot of discussion in Germany and (unintelligible) ICANN already certification access lab of (unintelligible) then the legitimate for the party and public interest have not been sorted out and the time limit and process is for

all our contracts. That was one question that the registries and registrars also were asking on a topic.

And -- yes -- I wanted to do this session more as a exchanged session where we all share our experience. Also on Wednesday then in the following time, but in particular on the next slide I found a letter that (Guinnus Belgium) was supposed writing to ICANN (unintelligible) comment helpful and interesting and really focused in a key language on - and several points.

Maybe, (Peter), you could say something on your letter you are writing.

Peter Vergote: Okay. Thanks (unintelligible) gladly.

Basically we're a bit upset, because the prior steps that I can mate with regard to (GDPR) compliance were helpful in a sense that we want to line up (unintelligible) policy for all (RTL) lease. Both will be (unintelligible). It's very difficult from us from a registry point of view and the same applies to our registrars that are trying to sell or services our products to explain that you have one registry to this operating all three (unintelligible) lease living in the same jurisdiction, but yet with the very different (unintelligible) results being, like (unintelligible) we already have a very substantial level of protection in (Brissals) and Vlaanderen everything is available in the (unintelligible).

So we wanted to align up (unintelligible) policy for dot Brussels and Vlaanderen we built be (unintelligible).

And now what we have been seeing is that the interim proposed model has presented the icon goes way further than what is usually the case for (CTT) lease. And -- yet -- at the same time it's moving to discretion or putting this -- with discretion -- behind some kind of offense.

And the result would be that now in the (unintelligible) that you basically would see far less information than what is currently on average available in

(CCT) lease. Because ICANN does not make a (unintelligible) or does not allow (unintelligible) to be made by the individual registry between corporate registrations and private registrations.

But the more frightening thing is that everything is put behind a so-called fence. But there are numerous back doors that would still allow for an full undisclosed access to (who is). If God knows who says, like, "Okay. You're law enforcement from country X, so you're considered to be something like a trusted (notifier)." You can have full access to the (who is) of the (gTLD) that is based in country Y or country (unintelligible). So that's completely, completely non-compliance with the principle of privacy by design and privacy by default.

So actually the ICANN model is very troublesome at this time and that's why we sent that letter to ICANN.

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes. (Amadao), you were sending a letter too. That was the next slide.

Lucky Masilela: Okay.

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes. (Unintelligible).

Man: No. Wait. Wait. And…

Man: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: And there we are.

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay. Please go ahead.

Man: (Unintelligible) too many things, but to focus on the important ones. I am less worried than (Peter) being these are from city (unintelligible) not (unintelligible). Being, you know, what the users need and what the legal authorities want is more important and that differs from country to country.

But at the end of the day the critical things (unintelligible) many, many, many different things. The critical thing is the back door as (Peter) said. Yes. Break out, you know, (unintelligible) a lot of important things.

But the real question is (unintelligible) all this to first have (unintelligible) emails in which everybody gets spam as now, which is the source of most of the complaints the (GPA)s get regarding the (who is) and then they start investigating.

And the second, anybody like, you know, I'm a lawyer, she's a lawyer, I don't know how many lawyers are you in this room. There might be more than two, more than 20 perhaps, right?

If we all get full set of that or even all the registrars -- I mean -- if -- I don't know -- (unintelligible) is not a registrar for (unintelligible) why in hell should we have access to their data. We don't have any transfer to perform. This is what important. This (unintelligible) compliant. No.

Some people say, "Oh, we need to approve the foreman, approve the axis, too much work." Let me give you a couple of the statistics and I will ask (dot) (unintelligible) to confirm.

For (unintelligible) which is bigger (unintelligible) was (unintelligible). The average is you get, you know, one request per year. They're each 500 domains. So you will get one per day. If you have to handle 1000 domains. I don't think - there are not that many (TLD)s (unintelligible) 200,000 domains. (Unintelligible) how many (TLD)s are here with more than 100 domains. All

the rest will receive less than one request per day, so it's manageable. Their (unintelligible) probably also in Belgium, also in Canada.

So just saying that everybody has the access, because there is no alternative. Or we -- as registrars (unintelligible) -- there will be too much work is blatantly false.

Now if we give (unintelligible) doors everybody will come and ask everything. There's the database, I have the chance to look at that. I will do it even if I don't have any need for that. There is data. That may have a value of one day. All right? We know that.

So in order to fulfill our legal obligations and our obligations with our registrants (unintelligible) I think we nearly - really need to push for a limitation of this back door to really have (unintelligible) purpose and to offer to check that, because -- I repeat -- both ethnic and (dot Cat) are able to survive in this model. Is that correct, (Cedric)?

(Cedric Pernet): Yes. Just completing that (unintelligible) we (unintelligible) (TLD) we have 3 million domain name, which are archived domain names and we have a personal data disclosure procedure, work with (unintelligible) on our website and we received 7000 requests per year. So it's not so much compared to the number of…

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Cedric Pernet): Seven hundred. Seven - yes.

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Cedric Pernet):   So sorry, 7000.

Man: It's one for each four hundred something domain.

(Cedric Pernet):   Yes.

Man: Yes.

(Cedric Pernet):   And then -- just to complete for (dot) (unintelligible) -- we just check their organization better, which are complete for domain names and those of the Paris (TLD). It's 78% of domain names (unintelligible) 80% of domain names, which are reserved by organization. And we (unintelligible) has a organization and that I completed.

Man: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible) doesn't even have statistics, because it would be waste of time to make those statistics. Because a total number of cases coming from IP lawyers or law enforcement agencies, total number (unintelligible) -- I don't know -- maybe five, six total number in these number of years.

That is perhaps not the average situation. But well, you know, the point is if you want this to be another (unintelligible) then, you know, we're killing it from the beginning. Whereas now the caveats for making it something to be managed by the registry are simply meaningless -- I mean -- they don't represent any kind of problem for the registry. They may represent a problem for ICANN maybe.

Man: Or (Verisign).

Man:	Or (Verisign). But it's not a problem for the registry. Just the opposite I would say, because there is where you have the control or - of who you are opening it - the registry up for, right?

Dirk Krischenowski:	(Unintelligible).

Man:	I do understand it's a problem, but I think I will be careful to have a model where you actually acquire manual work by the registry to handle that kind of forwarding over of the itemized emails.

And -- even though (unintelligible) the magic system can be gained -- I think there'll be criticism as you see with the (unintelligible). It's the - you know, it's just kind of a simple job. It takes a lot of time and cost (unintelligible).

Man:	The problem there is that you need to prove that this person has done something illegal to deny that. So you need to accept everybody (unintelligible) but you need to (unintelligible) manually at the end.

Now imagine (unintelligible) the only thing you need to do is say, "Oh you want this domain and for what?" (Unintelligible) having this form, even you send that individually and you control that you will erase out all these people that will send form for each and every single domain, because you will detect that.

So the simple thing of putting a firewall somewhere will deter the abuse of the system. If you say here you have an email, push here, it will get there, the system will be a complete disaster and we'll be discussing all that three months from now.

Man:	Just going to the next slide that could be a relief for some of us on idea of a relief what - when you look what (unintelligible) that does allowing the access to that database, but for 400 pounds per year.

Man: Yes.

Man: Just - I just wanted to give that - what individual solutions from (unintelligible) to (unintelligible) and to others are coming…

((Crosstalk))

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man:…coming these days.

Man: Seeing the second point, what is the point of that, right? The search of (who is) allows you to search using wild cards. But I'm not sure if we want wild cards. I mean…

Man: You want concrete applications for concrete context for concrete reasons, right? And you want to provide that information, which -- in a way -- is an exception to what you're promising to your registrants if there is a valid reason for that. Otherwise you're not.

                      But with the wild card, just open it up.

Dirk Krischenowski: (Maxine)? (Unintelligible).

Man: (Maxine) (unintelligible). Basically if you see who is behind this suggestion thrown (unintelligible) side (unintelligible) there was a group between the registries, registrars, public safety working group about (unintelligible) (11-3B) and they tried to pull this thing with, like, unknown trusted third parties.

                      And in the end the paper got (unintelligible) because in our particular country for (unintelligible) with this particular kind of guys -- people from

(unintelligible) went to jail. So delivering the data they wanted, particular (who is) data.

So it's could be its reason depending on the jurisdiction to share and some data (unintelligible) law enforcement and it's always only the local law enforcement. And in the worst case it could be inter-governmental cross recognition treating in place they (unintelligible) no more.

And for us it's -- yes -- it's a disaster. And formally saying you don't have a way to establish who is on the other side, because people in agencies they attempt to lose (unintelligible) et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

Man: Yes.

Man: And the (unintelligible) and -- yes -- they should always go to Interpol. It doesn't work (unintelligible) very good.

Man: I think that also for (unintelligible) their instructing -- interesting the fact of all of that -- is that the system was designed with the law enforcement agencies to have direct access to everything. You have to provide the I.D., blah, blah, blah.

Now they always reject. It's not (unintelligible) we are very happy with (unintelligible) you and you provide that, because, you know, we are different people, we don't know (unintelligible) but we know who you are and how you send your communication.

So at the end of the day it's time they did something, they send an email to (unintelligible) and they get the answer, right, and that's it. They don't want…

Dirk Krischenowski: Oh okay.

Man: …a direct (unintelligible).

Dirk Krischenowski: (Peter), last speaker, then we make a group photo.

Man: Okay.

Dirk Krischenowski: And then continue on Wednesday.

Peter Vergote: Just…

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes. Yes.

Peter Vergote: Okay. Just want to remark about the (Nominant) (unintelligible) and I'm not the specialist, but I would assume that if (Nominant) would limit that access to the (unintelligible) that automatically those limitations also report - apply for this kind of service.

I am not certain that this service allows you access to more data than the ones that are usually already available through (unintelligible). So…

Dirk Krischenowski: Let's make the group photo now. And that…

Sue Schuler: If we could have all the numbers line up maybe over on this side from (Sener) down to (Simma) and stand back and fill in the chairs and we'll - we got to do this very quickly. There's another meeting coming in. Thank you.

END